

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION

TIMOTHY JONES,

Case No. 1:05-cv-90

Plaintiff,

Spiegel, J.  
Black, M.J.

vs.

SHAW ENVIRONMENTAL  
& INFRASTRUCTURE INC.,

Defendant.

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION<sup>1</sup> THAT PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT BE  
DISMISSED, AND THIS CASE CLOSED, PURSUANT TO THE PENDING  
SHOW CAUSE ORDER (Doc. 4)**

The Court previously entered a Show Cause Order in this matter, and advised plaintiff that his complaint would be dismissed if he failed to timely comply with the Order. (Doc. 4) In view of the fact that the time deadline set forth in the Show Cause Order has passed without a responsive filing being made by plaintiff, the Court **RECOMMENDS** that plaintiff's complaint be **DISMISSED** for failure to effect service of process of the summons and complaint and this case **CLOSED**. *See Habib v. General Motors Corp.*, 15 F.3d 72, 73 (6th Cir. 1994); *United States v. Gluklick*, 801 F.2d 834, 836-37 (6th Cir. 1986).

**Date:** February 14, 2006

s/ Timothy S. Black

Timothy S. Black  
United States Magistrate Judge

---

<sup>1</sup> Attached hereto is a NOTICE to the parties regarding objections to this Report and Recommendation.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION

TIMOTHY JONES,

Case No. 1:05-cv-90

Plaintiff,

Spiegel, J.  
Black, M.J.

vs.

SHAW ENVIRONMENTAL  
& INFRASTRUCTURE INC.,

Defendant.

**NOTICE**

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), any party may serve and file specific, written objections to this Report & Recommendation (“R&R”) within **TEN (10) DAYS** of the filing date of this R&R. That period may be extended further by the Court on timely motion by either side for an extension of time. All objections shall specify the portion(s) of the R&R objected to, and shall be accompanied by a memorandum of law in support of the objections. A party shall respond to an opponent’s objections within **TEN (10) DAYS** after being served with a copy of those objections. Failure to make objections in accordance with this procedure may forfeit rights on appeal. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1981).